

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 29 and 39 have been amended without adding new matter. Claim 40 has been canceled. The remarks below in response to claim rejections refer to claims as amended herein. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-15, 17-19, 21-30, 32-39, 41-43, 45-47, 49-51, 53, 54 and 56-60 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-14, 19, 22-25, 27-30, 33, 37-41, 43, 45-47, 49-51 and 53-54 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0032775 A1 to Srinivasan et al. ("Srinivasan"). Though not specifically stated in the Office Action, claim 36 has evidently been rejected under Section 102(e) in view of Srinivasan also (see Office Action page 7, paragraph 12).

Claim 40 has been canceled without acquiescence to the reason for rejection, rendering rejection of that claim moot.

Applicant submits that all pending claims recite one or more limitations not disclosed by Srinivasan. For example, claim 1 recites, in part:

translating, in response to first translation information, the first bit group from the first position to a different position in a comparand;

translating the second bit group from the second position to a second position of the comparand in response to second translation information;

selecting the first translation information in a first cycle and the second translation information in a second cycle;

Applicant submits that Srinivasan does not disclose the above recited combination. Srinivasan discloses that the filtering of an input string may be accomplished sequentially (Srinivasan, paragraph 58) and discloses various embodiments for bit-by-bit programming of a filter circuit (Srinivasan, generally at paragraph 71 and more specifically at paragraphs 78-101), but Srinivasan does not specifically disclose *translating a first bit group in response to first translation information selected in a first cycle and translating a second bit group in response to second translation information selected in a second cycle*. Therefore, Srinivasan does not anticipate claim

1, nor claims 2-4, 6-7 or 9-13 which depend from and further limit claim 1.

Regarding claim 14, applicant submits that Srinivasan does not disclose the following limitation:

a decode circuitry coupled to the storage element to decode the translation information and to establish a connection in the switch circuit between the first position and the position in the comparand

Srinivasan discloses a decoder 1304 for decoding the output of an address counter 1302 (Srinivasan, paragraph 79, referring to Figure 12), but does not disclose decode circuitry to decode the translation information as recited in applicant's claim 14. For example, assuming *arguendo* that the program data of Srinivasan is equivalent to the translation information (i.e., as posited in the Office Action at page 6, paragraph 12), ***Srinivasan does not disclose that the filter data is decoded by the decoder 1304.*** Accordingly, Srinivasan does not anticipate claim 14 nor claims 19, 22-25, 27 or 28 which depend from and further limit claim 14.

Claim 29 recites, in part:

wherein each of the plurality of translation circuitry is configured to translate each of the plurality of bit groups in a respective operation cycle

As discussed above, Srinivasan discloses that the filtering of an input string may be accomplished sequentially (Srinivasan, paragraph 58) and discloses various embodiments for bit-by-bit programming of a filter circuit (Srinivasan, generally at paragraph 71 and more specifically at paragraphs 78-101), but Srinivasan does not specifically disclose ***translating each of a plurality of bit groups in a respective operation cycle.*** Therefore, Srinivasan does not anticipate claim 29, nor claims 30, 33, or 36-38 which depend from and further limit claim 29.

Claim 39 recites, in part:

decode circuitry coupled to the storage element to decode the translation information and to establish a switch circuit connection in the switch circuit between the first position and the position in the comparand

As discussed above, Srinivasan discloses a decoder for decoding the output of an address counter (Srinivasan, paragraph 79; Figure 12), but does not disclose decode

circuitry to decode the translation information. Therefore, Srinivasan does not anticipate claim 39 nor claim 41 which depends from and further limits claim 41. Claim 40 has been canceled, rendering the rejection of that claim moot.

Claim 43 recites, in part:

means for decoding the translation information

Applicant submits that, at least for the reasons given above in reference to claim 14, Srinivasan does not disclose means for decoding the translation information and therefore that Srinivasan does not anticipate claim 43 nor claim 45 which depends from and further limits claim 43.

Claim 46 recites, in part:

a decode circuitry coupled to the storage element to decode the translation information and to establish a switch circuit connection between the first position and the position in the comparand

Applicant submits that, at least for the reasons given above in reference to claim 14, Srinivasan does not disclose the above-recited limitation and therefore that Srinivasan does not anticipate claim 46 nor claim 47 which depends from and further limits claim 43.

Claim 49 recites, in part:

means for translating, in response to first translation information, the first bit group from the first position to a different position in a comparand;

means for comparing the comparand with data stored in a CAM array;

means for translating the second bit group from the second position to a second position of the comparand in response to second translation information; and

means for selecting the first translation information in a first cycle and the second translation information in a second cycle

Applicant submits that, at least for the reasons given above in reference to claim 1, Srinivasan does not disclose the above-recited combination and therefore that Srinivasan does not anticipate claim 49 nor claims 50-51 or 53-54 which depend from and further limit claim 49.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 15, 26, 32 and 42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,467,349 to Huey et al. ("Huey"); claim 17 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan in view of Huey and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,978,307 to Proebsting et al. ("Proebsting"); claims 18, 34-35 and 56-58 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan in view of Proebsting; and claims 59 and 60 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan in view of Proebsting and further in view of Huey;

Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c), subject matter developed by another person which qualifies as prior art only under one or more of subsections (e), (f), and (g) of 35 USC §102 shall not preclude patentability under section 103 where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the claimed invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Applicant submits that, if Srinivasan qualifies as prior art at all, Srinivasan qualifies as prior art only under subsection 102(e) and further that, as stated in a Declaration of Common Ownership enclosed herewith, the subject matter of Srinivasan and the invention claimed in the present application were, at the time the claimed invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. Accordingly, applicant submits that Srinivasan may not be relied upon, alone or in combination with other references, to reject applicant's claims under Section 103 and therefore that the Section 103(a) rejections of claims 15, 18, 26, 32, 34-35, 42 and 56-60 are moot.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 21 has been objected to as dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of their respective base claims and any intervening claims.

Applicant acknowledges the allowability of claim 21, but respectfully declines to rewrite claim 21 in independent form at this time.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. If a telephone interview would be helpful in any way, the examiner is invited

to call the undersigned attorney.

A petition for a two (2) month extension of time is enclosed herewith.

Authorization is hereby given to charge deposit account 501914 for any fee deficiency associated with this submission.

Respectfully submitted,

SHEMWELL GREGORY & COURTNEY LLP

Date August 11, 2005



Charles E. Shemwell, Reg. No. 40,171
Tel. 408-236-6645